# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA CEDAR RAPIDS DIVISION

EDWARD D. HEATON,

Plaintiff,

vs.

THE WEITZ COMPANY, INC.,

Defendant.

No. 05-CV-102-LRR

SUPPLEMENTAL FINAL JURY INSTRUCTIONS

Members of the jury, the instructions I have given you throughout the trial remain in effect. I will now give you some additional instructions.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL INSTRUCTION NO. 1

In addition to actual damages you have already considered, the law permits the jury under limited circumstances to award an injured person punitive damages.

Because you found in favor of Plaintiff, you must now decide whether Defendant acted with malice or reckless indifference to Plaintiff's right not to be retaliated against because of his opposition to national origin harassment or discrimination. Defendant acted with malice or reckless indifference if:

It has been proved by the greater weight of the evidence that Human Resource Manager Chantry DeVries and Vice President Michael Novy knew that by demoting or laying Plaintiff off from work and failing to recall him to work was in violation of the laws prohibiting retaliation, or was in reckless disregard of those laws.

However, you may not award punitive damages if it has been proved by the greater weight of the evidence that Defendant made a good-faith effort to comply with the laws prohibiting retaliation.

If you find that Defendant acted with malice or reckless disregard and did not make a good-faith effort to comply with the laws, then, in addition to any actual damages to which you find Plaintiff entitled, you may, but are not required to, award Plaintiff an additional amount as punitive damages if you find it is appropriate to punish Defendant or to deter Defendant and others from similar conduct in the future. Whether to award Plaintiff punitive damages, and the amount of those damages, are within your discretion.

(CONTINUED)

### SUPPLEMENTAL INSTRUCTION NO. 1 (cont'd)

If you decide to award punitive damages, you should consider the following in determining the amount of the punitive damages award: the nature of the Defendant's conduct under the totality of the circumstances; the frequency of Defendant's conduct; how reprehensible Defendant's conduct was toward Plaintiff; what amount of punitive damages, in addition to the compensatory damages already awarded, is needed, considering Defendant's financial condition, to punish Defendant for its wrongful conduct toward Plaintiff and to deter Defendant and others from similar wrongful conduct in the future; the amount of fines and civil penalties applicable to similar conduct; and whether the amount of punitive damages bears a reasonable relationship to the compensatory damages already awarded.

DATED this 29th day of Movember, 2006.

LINDA R. READE

JUDGE, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA CEDAR RAPIDS DIVISION

EDWARD D. I	HEATON,	
Plaintiff,		No. 05-CV-102-LRR
vs. THE WEITZ COMPANY, INC., Defendant.		SUPPLEMENTAL VERDICT FORM
We, the ju	ary, unanimously find the fo	ollowing verdict on the question submitted to
Question 4:	Has it been proved by the greater weight of the evidence that Defendant The Weitz Company, Inc., acted with malice or reckless indifference to Plaintiff Edward D. Heaton's right not to be retaliated against because of his opposition to national origin harassment or discrimination?	
	Please answer "yes" o	or "no."
	Answer:	
(If your answer	to Question 4 is "yes," ple	ease proceed to answer Question 5 below. If

your answer to Question 4 is "no," do not answer any further questions, sign and date this Supplemental Verdict Form.).

(CONTINUED)

# SUPPLEMENTAL VERDICT FORM (cont'd)

<b>Question 5:</b>	
Note: Answer only if you answered	"yes" to Question 4.
What damages do you award for:	
\$Punitive damages  (After answering Question 5, please	sign and date the Supplemental Verdict Form).
Dated this day of	, 2006.
Foreperson	Juror
Juror	Juror
Juror	Juror
Juror	 Juror